

**REMARKS**

In the Office action, claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Crawford '008; and claims 6 and 7 were rejected as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Sugiyama.


Claim 1 as amended recites that the ferrule is case hardened over substantially its entire surface. The Crawford ferrule 3 is not case hardened, and Sugiyama only references a rear ferrule that has a front end that is case hardened. The art of record did not appreciate the ability to fully case harden a ferrule, especially a front ferrule as in claim 3, with two cylindrical portions as recited in the claims. The claim further recites that the cylindrical portion adjacent the front edge is the smallest diameter of the interior wall. Crawford has a step at the front edge so that the step is not the smallest diameter of the interior wall, accordingly the Crawford ferrule cannot hinge and collet as can the ferrule of the present invention and as recited in new dependent claim 8.

The dependent claims are separately patentable but further comment will be deferred pending further examination of claim 1. It is noted however that it is believed that the art of record does not teach or suggest a ferrule, such as a front or rear ferrule in a two ferrule fitting, that is case hardened over substantially its entire surface and that has the recited cylindrical portions, with the effect of causing a hinging and collet action.

The present application is deemed to be in proper condition for allowance and favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 7, 2004

  
Leonard L. Lewis  
Reg. No. 31,176